

Appln. No. 09/496,824
Amdt. dated May 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 6, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks Examiner Zia for the interview by telephone on April 21, 2005. The Applicant also thanks Examiner Zia and Examiner Sheikh for the interview by telephone on May 4, 2005. The following is a summary of those interviews.

The main subject of the interviews was the rejection of claim 1 on page 4 at paragraph 7 of the January 6, 2005 Office Action. The Applicant set forth his position that the cited portions of Todd (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,689) do not teach the limitations of claim 1, as the Examiner asserts in sections (a), (b) and (d) in paragraph 7 of the January 6, 2005 Office Action, and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn. The Applicant had previously set forth this position in the Response filed on August 2, 2004, at pages 2 and 3. For example, the limitation "receiving a resource allocation request from a client" is not taught in Todd at col. 5, lines 66-67 to col. 6, lines 1-14 and 50-56. Rather, col. 5, line 66 through column 6, line 14 of Todd describe a method of assessing the security vulnerability of target hosts, and do not describe resource allocation in any way. Lines 50-56 of Todd describe establishing a "fact file" on a server, and building a "table of the available service," but do not teach or suggest a request for resource allocation as required by claim 1.

Further, the limitation "imposing on said client a computational task and a time limit for correct completion of said computational task" is not taught in Todd at col. 6, lines 40-67 as the Examiner asserts. Instead, col 6, lines 40-67 of Todd teach a seller sending, to a user, an e-mail containing information relating to the requested vulnerability assessment or series of assessments. The e-mail includes a URL the user can access for assessment results (col. 6, lines 47-49). These lines of Todd further teach a security algorithm for performing the vulnerability assessment, and storing the results in a hypertext report file accessible by the user via the URL from the e-mail described above (col. 6, lines 57-62). No computational task to be correctly completed within a time limit is imposed on a client, as required by claim 1.

The limitation "allocating said resource for said client if the verification is received" is not taught in Todd at co. 6, lines 15-26 as the Examiner asserts. Rather, col. 6, lines 15-26 teach a seller computer with hypertext pages that are accessible to a user (col. 6, lines 15-19). These lines also teach a user selecting a particular security assessment service via the hypertext page (col. 6, lines 21-26), but do not teach resource allocation upon receipt of a verification of task

Appln. No. 09/496,824
Amdt. dated May 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 6, 2005

completion. This text from Todd makes no mention or suggestion of verification of a task completion, or of any resource allocation as a result of such verification, as required by claim 1.

Since the other independent claims 18, 27 and 47 also require the elements of these limitations, the same arguments set forth above also apply to independent claims 18, 27 and 47. Therefore the rejections of claims 1, 18, 27 and 47, and accordingly those of the associated dependent claims, should be withdrawn.

In the telephone interview of May 4, 2005, Examiner Zia and Examiner Sheikh agreed to withdraw these rejections in light of these arguments. Further, during the interview Examiner Zia and Examiner Sheikh requested the Applicant to present examples, from the specification, of the "computational task" recited in claim 1. To that end, the Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to the first and second paragraphs of page 11 of the specification, which provides some examples of a computational task as recited in independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 47. Other examples of the computational tasks as recited in independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 47 can be found beginning at the last paragraph of page 22 of the specification. The Applicant stresses that these are merely examples of the computational task as recited in independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 47, and are not intended to be limiting.

For the reasons stated above, we believe the claims are allowable, and therefore ask the Examiner to allow them to issue.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: MAY 6, 2005



Ronald R. Demsher
Reg. No. 42,478

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 526-6000
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000